

## RESISTANCE AGAINST BEING FORMULATED AS CULTURAL OTHER: THE CASE OF A CHINESE STUDENT IN JAPAN<sup>1</sup>

Chie Fukuda

### Abstract

So-called traditional theories in second language acquisition (SLA) have been criticized for their neglect to examine interactional, social, and political aspects in language practices. The present study will illustrate exoticization, one of the political phenomena observed in interactions between native-speaker and non-native speaker (NS/NNS). Exoticization is known as a covert power exercise where 'self' creates inferior 'other' in order to establish and maintain its superiority (Said 1978), which involves identity construction and categorization. Adopting a conversation analysis (CA) approach and utilizing NS-NNS conversations in Japanese, this study will first demonstrate how exoticization is discursively constructed through the development of interactions. Then the study will explore how the NNS participant tries to resist such practices. By so doing, this study will shed light on interactional and ideological aspects of language practices and society as a learning environment. The study will also suggest the necessity for exploring what NNSs face in real L2 societies in order to develop emic perspectives in SLA studies.

**Keywords:** Exoticization; Power and ideology; Identity construction; Categorization; Japanese conversation analysis (CA).

### 1. Introduction

So-called traditional studies of second language acquisition (SLA) have been criticized for neglecting to examine interactional, social, and political aspects of native speaker and non-native speaker (NS/NNS) interaction (e.g., Firth & Wagner 1997; Markee & Kasper 2004; Pavlenko 2002; Pennycook 2001; Roberts 1998; Shea 1994). These critiques have pointed out that the traditional studies hold etic perspectives (i.e., researcher-relevant) rather than emic ones (participant-relevant), thereby ignoring issues such as identity construction and the host society as a learning environment. Following these critiques, an increasing number of studies explore language practices between NS and NNS from interactional and critical perspectives (e.g., Baquedano-López 1997; Duff 2002; Garret and Baquedano-López 2002; Harklau 2003; He 2003; Lo 2004; Talmy 2004, 2005).

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Gabriele Kasper, Dennis Day, John H. Haig, Machiko Achiba, and Erica Zimmerman for their invaluable comments on the earlier draft and their encouragements. I also appreciate Hunter B. Hatfield for his thorough editorial assistance. An earlier version was presented at the AILA (The 14<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Applied Linguistics) at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, July 2005. All errors and misinterpretation of the literatures and data are entirely my own.

In accordance with this approach, the present study will illustrate one political phenomenon, exoticization (Talmy 2004, 2005), in NS-NNS conversations in Japanese. Utilizing Conversation Analysis (CA) and the concept of epistemic and affective stances (Ochs 2002) as analytic tools, what this study will attempt is twofold. First, it will demonstrate how exoticization is discursively constructed through the development of talk-in-interaction. Then the study will explore how the NNS subject tries to resist such practices. By so doing, this study will suggest the necessity for exploring interactional aspects and socio-political issues in order to grasp what the participants are doing in locally situated interactions. This will also serve as a counterexample to idealized etic perspectives in the traditional studies of SLA, thereby contributing to the development of more emic perspectives in the field.

## 2. Previous studies

### 2.1. Language and power: What is neglected in traditional SLA

Language is a primary resource that people use in order to create their social realities. Through social interaction, mainly mediated by language, one can realize his/her worldview. The worldview is revealed in the form of orientation in interaction in which participants make certain things relevant, utilizing various verbal and non-verbal resources. In such interaction, categorization and construction of identity play a significant role in order to examine, not only orientation of participants (i.e., at the micro-level), but also that of the society (the macro-level). Hawkins states the micro and macro interrelation as follows:

"Identity formulation can be described as an ongoing negotiation between the individual and the social context or environment, with particular attention paid to operant culture and power relations. Individuals bring lived histories to activities and events in situated environments, and it is through communications and interactions with others in these environments that learners negotiate and co-construct their views of themselves and the world. The activities and contexts, however, are imbued with and represent specific values and ideologies (which privilege certain practices over others), and those shape the dynamics of the interactions." (2005: 61).

Thus, examining ordinary conversations reveals the interplay and negotiation between micro-level discursive practices and macro-level social order. However, these aspects have been marginalized in traditional SLA research. Firth and Wagner describe this phenomenon as "the prioritizing of the individual-as-'NNS'/'learner' over the participant-as-language 'user' in social interaction" (1997: 286). They also point out the binary concept of the NS as model/ideal whereas the NNS as deficient/incompetent in traditional research. By so doing, this research has neglected to examine what the participants are doing in interaction (emic perspective), while mapping out etic NS/NNS labels in the studies.

Researchers supporting this criticism have discussed NS-NNS interaction, deploying ethnography, discourse analysis, CA, and critical theories. In this area, ideological issues such as linguicism, teacher-student power relations, and learners' resistance have recently garnered significant attention (e.g., Baquedano-López 1997; Day 1994, 1998; Duff 2002; Garret & Baquedano-López 2002; Harklau 2003; Lo 2004; Norton 2000; Talmy 2004, 2005; Watson-Gegeo 2003). 'Ideology' in this study is

defined as a "system of ideas, beliefs, values, attitudes, and categories by reference to which a person, a group, or society perceives, comprehends, and interprets the world" (Oktar 2001: 313-4) or a "particular framework of knowledge that is tied to social power and may be manifested in language" (Pennycook 2001: 82). Exoticization is one manifestation of such social power.

### 2.2. Exoticizing others and exoticizing self

Exoticization is one of the political issues that involves categorization and identity construction. Exoticization indicates regarding 'others' as exotic, mysterious, primitive, strange, and quite different from 'self.' It can take various forms that are recognized as seemingly apolitical. However, as Said (1978) clarified in his concept of Orientalism, the fundamental framework underlying exoticizing practices is the dialectic relationship or binary categorization between 'superior self' and 'inferior others.' In other words, 'self' necessitates 'other' in order to establish and maintain its superiority. Hall, based on Derrida's (1981) work, asserts: "There are very few neutral binary oppositions. One pole of the binary [...] is usually the dominant one, the one that includes the other within its field of operations. There is always a relation of power between the poles of a binary opposition" (2001: 329). Thus, exoticization may serve as covert and indirect power exertion in daily life, as demonstrated by some SLA and language socialization (LS) studies discussed below.

In their studies, Duff (2002) and Talmy (2004, 2005) problematize the exoticization by ESL teachers and NS classmates in their classroom interactions. In traditional theories of SLA/LS, the NS/expert, such as teachers and NS peers, are assumed to be those who are capable enough to lead NNS/novices to proper behaviors. Their studies, however, refute the concept of the idealized NS by revealing covert power exercise in the exoticization of immigrant students.

In particular, Talmy's (2004, 2005) critical ethnography illuminates how teachers and NS peers formulate an immigrant ESL student as the "exoticized cultural and linguistic Other" (2004: 149) through linguicism - in a more sophisticated, socially acceptable form of racism and classism (p. 152). By soliciting a Micronesian student for more 'exotic' holiday practices (in this case, 'dancing around a fire on the beach') in his native country, the teacher and NS peers formulate the student as a cultural Other, which evokes "a racist imagery of mysterious, fire-walking 'savage' (p. 167).

In addition to previous study of exoticizing others NS-NNS interaction in Japan (e.g., Siegal 1994), Kasper and Rose (2002) observed 'ethnolinguistic ideology,' which indicates 'auto-exoticizing' views of Japanese culture and language (Coulmas 1992). This ideology often manifests in NS-NNS conversations, such as overemphasis on the uniqueness of the Japanese language and culture. This is widely observed in Japan (Iino 1996; Kubota 2002). Iino (1996) calls this phenomenon where NSs treat NNSs/foreigners as someone quite different from the Japanese *gaijinization* 'foreignization.' *Gaijinization* or alienation of foreigners includes both exoticizing self and exoticizing others. It also involves categorization and identity construction, given that one's identity consists of an 'identity asserted by self' and an 'identity assigned by others' (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998; Cornell and Hartmann 1998).

### 2.3. Identity, categorization, and interculturality

In the constructivist approach, identity is not given, static, *a priori*, or monolithic but complex, fluid, dynamic, and hybrid. It emerges in locally situated interactions (e.g., Kondo 1990). Given that exoticization inherently entails categorization and identity construction of one interlocutor as a member of one culture and another interlocutor as of another, exoticization should also be analyzed as such. In other words, interculturality (i.e., the fact that participants come from different cultures) should not be taken for granted by researchers, but should be explored in terms of "how it is that the fact of being intercultural is organized as a social phenomenon" (Nishizaka 1995: 302).

Following Nishizaka's (1995) approach, Mori's (2003) study explicates how interculturality is interactively achieved in the moment-by-moment shift of participation structure. Through the analysis of initial encounter conversations between Japanese and American students, Mori demonstrates how interculturality emerges through the sequential arrangement of the participants' conduct, such as in question-answer sequences or the procedures for the next-speaker selection. In such sequences, categorization may be accomplished not only by an explicit, direct reference to a particular category in talk, but also by inference, drawn from a reference to a social relationship or activity bound to a particular category, i.e., 'category-bound activities' (Sacks 1972).

In Mori's data, however, direct categorization, such as 'are you Japanese/American?' never occurs; rather, interculturality becomes relevant through several actions. These factors are: The assumptions underlying questions that reflect on their categorization ('category-activity question'), delivery, and the selection of respondents to the questions, all of which emerge in the development of interactions. For example, the question 'have you ever seen Japanese movies?' assigns 'discourse identity' (e.g., C. Goodwin 1987; Zimmerman 1998) as a qualified respondent as well as 'social identity' (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998) as a novice of Japanese movies/culture. That is, the question categorizes the respondents (discourse identity), not as natives, but as novices to the Japanese language and culture (social identity), making the question intercultural relevant.

However, after setting up such a context, their talks do not necessarily remain intercultural oriented. It is contingent on how the participants develop the talk, i.e., how the participants treat certain topics, items, questions, problems, etc., as a resource of the sequential development of talk-in-interaction. Mori observes that in some sequences interculturality becomes salient (e.g., treating cultural items, solving a linguistic problem), but not in others. For example, in an excerpt in which the participants are talking about a Japanese comedian in an American movie, it is not whether the participants are American/Japanese but whether they have seen the movie or not that determines the participation structure in the talk.

In the similar vein, Day (1994) explored 'ethnification' processes through the analysis of conversations among multi-ethnic coworkers (Swedish, Yugoslav, Sino-Vietnamese, etc.) in Sweden. 'Ethnification' indicates "a series of actions which either directly or indirectly make an ethnic characterization of some individual or group a normatively and/or conventionally 'proper' description" (p. 315). He illustrated how the participants discursively categorize people and how these categorizations find expression through proper descriptions, in the enactment of particular social interactions.

Just like Mori's (2003) study, ethnic categorization emerged through the sequential organization of the talk. For example, one worker, Malia, tried to ethnify her coworker, Tang, as Chinese. Without explicitly naming her, Malia specified Tang as a qualified respondent by asking the meaning of stereotypical Chinese words. Tang, however, resisted Malia's ethnification by providing a minimal response.

## 3. Methodology and data

### 3.1. Methodology and research questions

As is the case of Mori's (2003) study, interculturality is not always made relevant in NS-NNS interactions in my data, either. However, for the purpose of exploring exoticizing practices, the present study will take up cases where interculturality becomes salient. This study will follow Mori's framework based on several CA notions, i.e., categorization, discourse identity, and social identity.

The present study will also adopt the concept of 'epistemic and affective stances' (Ochs 2002) in conjunction with 'indexicality' and 'lexical choice,' which are important concepts in CA. Epistemic stance indicates "knowledge or belief, including sources of knowledge and degrees of commitment to truth and certainty of propositions," whereas affective stance includes "a person's mood, attitude, feeling, or disposition as well as degree of emotional intensity" (Ochs 2002: 109). These stances, or the speaker's attitudes or orientations toward the proposition, are indexed through the choice of words that fit to these stances, the context, their roles there, and the like, as well as participation structure. For example, while someone may use 'cop' in ordinary conversation, when they are giving evidence in court, they are more likely to select 'police officer' instead (Sack 1979), thereby indexing stance and contextual differences. Lexical choice that displays epistemic and affective stances can shape whole sequence and the overall patterns of the interaction (Heritage 2004: 235). Thus, incorporating the concept of stances in CA is worthwhile to explicate participants' orientation in interaction. Utilizing these analytic tools, the present study will address the following questions:

1. How do the participants make interculturality/exoticization relevant in the development of talk, in terms of question-answer sequences, topic selection and delivery, and procedures for next-speaker selection?
2. What kind of categorization and identities are constructed, assigned, or asserted in such interactions and how?
3. Together with sequential organization of talk, what kinds of linguistic and non-linguistic (e.g., prosodic) resources are used to index epistemic and affective stances of the participants?

The transcription conventions are explained in the Appendix. Japanese utterances are followed by word-by-word glosses (also see Appendix for abbreviation) and English translation.

## 3.2. The subjects

The data was audio-recorded during the summer of 2004 in a large city in western Japan (Kansai). The main participants were Mr. and Mrs. K, NSs of Japanese (Kansai dialect) in their 70's and 60's, and a female graduate student T from China, a NNS of Japanese with near-native fluency. T had studied Japanese at a Chinese university for four years before coming to Japan in 2001 and is currently majoring in Japanese history in a Master's program at a city university. T is a scholarship student sponsored by an organization to which Mr. K belongs. The organization has monthly meetings so that members and scholarship students can interact. T and Mr. K became acquainted with each other at such meetings but have not yet become close. Mr. K invited T to his house, and this researcher, H, a Japanese NS and former student of Mr. K, joined the meeting.

## 4. Analysis

(1) [They were talking about H's life in the U.S. After this topic is over, Mr. K initiates a new topic as follows.

1. →Mr.K: *Soryaa, chu-chugoku no hito yuu no wa*  
well China LK people say Nom Top  
'Well, talking about Chinese people,
2. *kyuuryoo ga warui ne.*  
salary S had P  
their salary is bad.'
3. (2)
4. *Konaida itte bikkuri shita wa.*  
Other day went was surprised P  
'I was surprised when I visited there the other day.'
5. H: *Soo nan desu ka?*  
So Nom Cop Q  
'Oh, were you?'
6. Mr.K: *Un.*  
Yeah  
'Yeah.'
7. (3)
8. Mr.K: *Nihon no juuhun no ichi.*  
Japan LK one tenths  
'One-tenth of Japan'
9. H: *A:, sono gurai ja nai deshou ka ne?*  
uh that about isn't Aux Q P  
'Uh, that's really about that much, I wonder.'
10. Mr.K: *Iya<sup>2</sup>, un, sonna mon ya naa.*  
Well yes that much Cop P  
'Oh, well, it is about that.'
11. H: *Tsuki heikin de ichiman-en<sup>3</sup> kurai ja nakatta desu ka?*  
month average per 10000-yen around Tag Cop Q  
'Monthly average is about 10000 yen, isn't it?'
12. →T: *E? ichiman-en?*

<sup>2</sup> The word *iya* indexes several meanings as: Interjection 'oh' or 'no'; negative answer 'no'; expression of contradiction; initiator of repair (See Sait 1998).

<sup>3</sup> 10000 yen is roughly equivalent to 90 dollars U.S. currency (June, 2006).

- huh 10000-yen  
'Huh? 10000 yen?'
13. H: *Ichiman-en gurai =*  
10000-yen around  
'Around 10000 yen.'
14. Mr.K: *=Moo chotto aru yaru.*  
more a little exist Tag  
'There is more, isn't there?'
15. H: *Moo chotto arimasu?*  
More a little exist  
'There is more?'
16. Mr.K: *Motto aru.*  
more exist  
'Yes, it is.'
17. →T: *Heikin, moshi heikin te ittara, tabun ichiman-en kurai desu.*  
Average if average QT (if) talking perhaps 10000-yen around Cop  
'Average, if you talk about average, it is about 1000 yen.'

In line 1-2, Mr. K directly says that the salary of Chinese people is bad. The use of the word 'Chinese people' makes this sequence interculturally relevant. A topic marker *wa* can also indicate comparison between one thing and another (Kuno 1978; Yamaguchi 2003). In this case, it indicates a binary categorization between China and Japan. This becomes clear when Mr. K mentions Japan in line 8. Together with this categorization, Mr. K's use of the evaluative word *warui* 'bad' without any modal auxiliary or hedge indicates categorization of China as a lower income and quite different country from Japan. It also reveals not only exoticization but also obvious diminishment of China as such. H also aligns with Mr. K in line 9 and asks Mr. K whether the average monthly salary in China is about 10000 yen. Upon hearing this, T tries to reframe this orientation by initiating repair, *e? ichiman-en? 'huh? 10000 yen?'* in line 12. Mr. K aligns with T's reframing and corrects what he and H said in line 14 and 16. However, T eventually agrees with what H said, with the concession that it is correct if what they are talking about is an average.

(2) [After talking about the average salary in China, Mr. K extends the topic to Xinjiang Uigur, T's hometown.]

1. Mr.K: *Naa, heikin ittara, Uiguru nante ittara*  
P average (if) talking Uigur QT (f) talking  
'Well, talking about an average [salary], in Xinjian Uigur,
2. → *motto hikui no to chigau?*  
more low Nom Tag  
'salary is lower, isn't it?'
3. T: *Iya:, soo desu yo ne. Uiguru no hoo wa hikui to omoimasu.*  
well so Cop P P Yugur LK side Top low QT think  
'Well, I guess so. I think it is lower in Xinjiang Uigur [than in other places].'
4. →Mr.K: *Iya, yappari, nanika, ano:, bokuyoo ka nanika yaru no?*  
well as expected something well sheep breeding P something do P  
'Well, as I expected, something, well, do people breed sheep?'
5. T: *E?*  
huh  
'Huh?'
6. Mr.K: *Seikei wa?*  
livelihood Top  
'For livelihood?'

7. T: A:  
uh  
'Oh.'
8. (2)  
9. T: *Uiguru no hito wa, Shinkyo Uiguru jichi-ku tte ieba.*  
Uigur LK people Top Xinjiang Uigur autonomous region QT talking  
'People in Xinjiang Uigur, in the Xinjiang Uigur Autonomous Region,  
10. *minzoku ga takusan arimasu.*  
ethnic group S many exist  
'there are many ethnic groups.'
11. Mr.K: *Unun.*  
Uh-uh  
'Uh-uh.'
12. T: *De, sore de, un, noogyoo toka,*  
then then uh farming for example  
'Well, then, for example, they farm, and'  
13. →Mr.K: *A, noogyoo ga dekiru wake ka.*  
Oh farming S can reason Q  
'Oh, so you can farm there.'
14. T: *Un, noogyoo to, sore to, a, ato hooboku*  
yeah farming and then then oh also pasturage  
'Yes, farming and, well, pasturage.'
15. →Mr.K: *Hooboku ya nee.*  
pasturage Cop P  
'Pasturage, that's what I thought.'
16. T: *Soo desu nee. Ato, ironna, nanka eto., ano,*  
so Cop P also various like er uhm  
'Let me see, and various, er, well,  
17. *nanka tezukuri no, ano: nante iu? Ningyoo=*  
like handmade LK uhm what say doll  
'handmade, uhm, how do you say it? Doll'
18. Mr. K: = *Mingeihin.*  
handicraft  
'Handicrafts.'
19. T: *Ningyoo toka mingeihin toka, nanka iroirona mono.*  
doll for example handicraft for example like various things  
'Dolls, handicrafts, and various things.'
20. →Mr.K: ((cough)) *Soo ka, are yori wa megumarete iru wake ka. sono chiku wa nee.*  
so Q that than Top better-conditioned/blessed than others. Q that region Top P  
'I see. The region is better-conditioned/blessed than others.'
21. T: *A, hai. soko wa kekkoo, un, okome no sanchi: to*  
oh yes there Top rather um rice LK producing area and  
'Oh, yes. The place is rather famous for producing  
22. *kotton, no sanchi to, ano, kudamono no sanchi toshite yuumei desu.*  
cotton LK producing area and uhm fruits LK producing area as famous Cop  
rice, and, cotton, and fruits.'
23. (1)  
24. →Mr.K: *Soo ka. Jaa, chuugoku no naka demo megumareteru hoo da na.*  
so Q then China LK inside EMP better-situated side Cop P  
'I see. Then, the region is better-situated [than other places] in China.'
25. T: *Soo desu ne. kekkoo =*  
so Cop P rather  
'Right. Rather'

In line 1-2, Mr. K asks about an average salary in Xinjiang Uigur, using a negative question *motto hikui no to chigau?* '[an average salary in Xinjiang Uigur] is

lower [than other places in China], isn't it?' Use of tag question implies the strength of Mr. K's assumption of Xinjiang Uigur as such. T shows alignment, by saying *soo desu yo ne* 'I guess so; I agree' and affirms what Mr. K said with a hedge to *omoimasu* 'I think.' In line 4, Mr. K further asks whether people in Xinjiang Uigur breed sheep for livelihood. It is noteworthy that Mr. K does not ask a wh-question but a yes-no-question. Use of a yes-no question implies the strength of Mr. K's assumption of Xinjiang Uigur as a place where people live on sheep breeding, relying on a stereotypical image. It is also indicated by the use of a modal adverb *yappari* 'after all; as expected; you know,' which connotes that an actual situation expectedly conforms to a standard based on past experience, comparison with other people, or common sense (Makino & Tsutsui 1989: 538). Maynard states that modal verbs can reveal the very manner of how the speaking self perceives, epistemically characterizes, and contextualizes the propositional content within a given discourse framework (1991: 40). This is identical to Ochs' concept of stances. In this case, the strength of Mr. K's personal view or stereotypical image that people in Xinjiang Uigur make a living by breeding sheep is reflected.

T does not immediately understand what Mr. K said and shows trouble in hearing/understanding what Mr. K said by e? 'huh?' in line 5, which triggers other-initiated repair from Mr. K. Mr. K elaborates the question, offering the word *seikei* 'livelihood.' It is not clear whether this incomprehension indicates that what Mr. K said is totally outside of T's current assumptions or that T cannot understand the word *bokuyoo* 'sheep breeding' since the word is uncommon even for native speakers. In line 9, T starts to explain how people in Xinjiang Uigur make a living. After T mentions farming, Mr. K is surprised to know farming is possible there, saying *noogyoo ga dekiru wake ka* 'oh, so you can farm there' in line 13. This sentence can be regarded as assessment that signifies surprise and unexpectedness for Mr. K. When T refers to pasturage in line 14, Mr. K ratifies it by saying *hooboku ya nee* 'pasturage, that's what I thought.' *Ya* in the Kansai dialect is equivalent to copula *da* in standard Japanese (henceforth, SJ), which indicates affirmation and assertion (Maynard 1999) about what Mr. K said, e.g., Xinjiang Uigur is a place where people live on sheep breeding. A sentence final particle *ne(e)* soliciting agreement from the interlocutor also indexes the strength of Mr. K's epistemic stance toward his utterance.

Through the sequence of tag-question (line 2), alignment (line 3), related question (line 4), answer (line 12), assessment/surprise (line 13), further answer (line 14), and ratification (line 15), Mr. K's assumption about Xinjiang Uigur with no industry other than sheep breeding is revealed. Furthermore, in lines 20 and 24, Mr. K says that Xinjiang Uigur where people can farm is better-situated than other places in China, since people in Xinjiang Uigur can farm and produce rice, cotton, and fruits. Mr. K's statements imply that there are other further underprivileged areas in China. It also follows Mr. K's statement of China as a low income country as seen in excerpt (1). By contrast, Japan is assumed by Mr. K to be a country of higher economic status.

## (3)

1. →Mr.K: *Koogyoo wa anmari naine ya na?*  
manufacturing industry Top (not) so not-exist Cop P  
'There isn't so much of a manufacturing industry, is there?'
2. T: *Iya, hotondo koogyoo nan desu.*  
no almost manufacturing industry Nom Cop

3. →Mr.K: *Koogyoo wa aru no?*  
manufacturing industry Top exist P  
'Oh, there is manufacturing?'
4. T: *Arimasu.*  
Exist  
'Yes, there is.'
5. →Mr.K: *A, soo. Nanika (0.5) koshiraeteru wake?*  
oh really something make reason  
'Really? Do they make something?'
6. T: *hnhh. Soo desu yo ne? ( ) sono hen atashi mo anmari*  
so Cop P P that area I also (not) really  
'hnhh. Let me see. I don't know very much.'
7. Mr. K: *A, soo.*  
uh so  
'Oh, really?'
8. T: *kuwashiku nai desu.*  
know much Neg Cop  
'Not in detail.'
9. →Mr.K: *Ko-kojoo nanka mo?*  
fa- factory and the stuff also  
'Are there fa-factories as well?'
10. T: *Kojoo wa arimasu kedo, nan no kojoo deshou? ((laugh))*  
factory Top exist but what LK factory wonder  
'There are factories, but I wonder what kind of factories they are.'
11. H: ((laugh))
12. T: *( ) toka. nan deshou? Wakaranai. ((laugh))*  
for example what wonder don't know  
'( ), or something, I wonder. I don't know.'
13. Mr.K: *Wakaranai. ((laugh)) kankei nee ka*  
don't know relation not-exist P  
'You don't know. That means it has nothing to do with you.'
14. T: *((laugh)) Nan deshou? U::n, yappari sekiyu kankei no ( ) toka kana?*  
what wonder uh huh expected oil rekataub LK for example I wonder  
'What is that? We::ll, I wonder if it is oil-related ( ).'
15. →Mr.K: (0.2) *Are? ano hen, sekiyu deru?*  
Really that area oil produce/come out  
'Oh really? That area produces oil?'
16. T: *Demasu*  
produce/come out  
'It does.'
17. →Mr.K: *He::, soo ka. Uguru te (yuu no wa)*  
oh so Q Uigur QT say Nom Top  
'Oh, really? Xinjiang Uigur is ...'
18. T: *Ano, sa-sa-sabaku aru- arimasu deshou?*  
uhm de-de-desert exi- exist Tag  
'Uhm, around there, there is a de-de-desert, isn't it?'
19. Mr.K: *Un.*  
Yeah  
'Yeah.'
20. T: *De, bonchi de, Uguru bonchi no naka ni kekkoo sekiyu ga arimasu.*

<sup>4</sup> In Japanese, an affirmative answer to a negative question is *ie* or *iya* 'no,' which negate a meaning of a whole sentence (here, a sentence 'there isn't much of a manufacturing industry.')

<sup>5</sup> *Soo desu yo ne* indicates 'I guess so; I agree'; however, T seems to mistake it for *see desu ne(e)* 'let me see.' *Soo desu ne(e)* has two functions, depending on the context: 'I agree; that's right' and 'let me see,' and the latter is discussed here. This phenomenon is observed in excerpt (4) as well. This is discussed later.

- then basin in Uigur basin LK inside in rather oil S exist  
'Well, it is a basin and inside the basin, there is a lot of oil.'
21. Mr.K: *Sekiyu ga dereba taishita mon da kedo (1) Dore kurai, dore kurai deru ka.*  
oil S if produced great thing Cop but how much how much produce P  
'It is great if the region produce oil. (1) how much?'
22. T: *Kekkoo::, chungoku de ichiban ka nibanme kurai, no seisanryoo.*  
Rather China in first or second about LK amount of production  
'Pretty good bit. The greatest or second greatest amount of production in China.'
23. →Mr.K: *A, somna deru.*  
Oh that produce/come out  
'Oh, that much?'

Mr. K initiates a new topic about the manufacturing industry in Xinjiang Uigur with a negative question *koogyoo wa amari nai ne ya na?* (in SJ, *nai n(o) da ne?*) 'there is not so much of a manufacturing industry, is there?' This negative question assumes that few manufacturing industries exist in Xinjiang Uigur. Use of *n(o) da* and *ne* soliciting involvement and agreement, respectively, signifies the strong certainty of Mr. K's that Xinjiang Uigur lacks manufacturing capabilities. Furthermore, these linguistic devices reveal Mr. K's epistemic stance: A bias toward a negative answer. He does not expect a negative answer to this question; rather, he asks this question as a confirmation of what he thinks and as a soliciting agreement with it. However, T negates his assumption in line 2.

Upon hearing that there is a manufacturing industry in Xinjiang Uigur, Mr. K asks a further question *koogyoo wa aru no?* 'is there a manufacturing industry?' for confirmation with surprising intonation in line 3, and T affirms it. Mr. K further asks what they 'make.' What is noticeable here is the word Mr. K chooses, *koshiraeru* 'to make.'<sup>6</sup> Unlike the word *tsukuru* 'to make; to produce' in general, *koshiraeru* signifies to make something with simple procedures, such as meals, clothes, craft. *Koshiraeru* never evokes mass-production in modern factories. That is, the lexical choice also reflects Mr. K's assumption that factories in Xinjiang Uigur are cottage industries rather than large scale ones. Furthermore, if there is manufacturing, it follows that there are factories as well. However, in line 9, Mr. K asks whether there are factories in Xinjiang Uigur, and T affirms it. When T mentions the oil industry in line 14, Mr. K shows his surprise by an interjection *are?* 'oh, really?' After T explains about the amount of oil production, Mr. K again shows surprise with *hee* 'oh, my; indeed,' a news-recipient token (Mori 2003) in line 17.

Thus, there is a sequence of question - answer - confirmation question - answer - assessment/surprise - further confirmation question. Mr. K keeps asking questions for confirmation and continues being surprised at T's answers. Inversely speaking, this sequence, together with other lexical resources and prosodic features, implies persistence of Mr. K's skepticism about Xinjiang Uigur as an industrialized area. Given the excerpts (1) and (2), Mr. K assumes Xinjiang Uigur as an unindustrialized, developing, exotic place where people live on sheep breeding, quite different from Japan.

<sup>6</sup> I asked the difference to several native speakers of Kansai dialect (including Mr. K in another opportunity, without referring to this excerpt), and almost all of them agreed with this connotation of *koshiraeru*.



## (4)

[The topic has changed to Mr. and Mrs. K's travel in China a couple of months prior to the day of the data collection. In Chengdu (a city of China), they saw many deserted buildings consisting only of frames, which they found shocking. Mr. and Mrs. K explain the reason for the abandoned structures, which was explained by a local guide.]

1. Mrs.K: *Iyaiya, kekkyoku moo, amarinimo hatten ga ne.*  
no no after all EMP extremely development S P  
'Well, it is because the development is extremely rapid.'
2. *kitsui sakai ni, te yuute hatta ne*  
intensive because QT say [honorific] P  
'That's what the guide said.'
3. Mr.K: = *Chuushi meirei ya.*  
stop order Cop  
'They got an order to stop.'
4. T: *Hu:n chuushi meirei.*  
oh stop order  
'Oh, an order to stop.'
5. →Mr.K: *Sekkaku ishhookenmei yarikaketeta noni.*  
with effort hard tried to do but  
'Although they worked so hard, they have to
6. *[mate, iwaretaru sorede shimai ya.*  
Wait if ordered that end Cop  
cancel if they are ordered to stop.'
7. Mrs.K: *[Mate yuute.*  
wait said  
'The government says 'stop.'
8. → *Soo deshou? Chuugoku te.*  
so Tag China QT  
'China is like that, isn't it?'
9. H: ( )  
'( )'
10. T: *Iya, un. [doo daroo?]*  
well uhm how wonder  
'Well, uhm, I wonder why.'
11. Mr.K: *[Sore ga monosugoi medatta naa.*  
That S extremely outstanding P  
'That was really outstanding.'
12. →T: *Iya, demo soo desu yo ne. watashi mo Seito ni itta*  
well but so Cop P P I also Chengdu to go  
'Oh, well, but it is right.'
13. *toki kekko arimasu node,*  
when rather have (experiences) therefore  
'I have also been to Chengdu, so
14. *chotto doo ita koto kana? Chotto wakaranakute.*  
a little what-kind thing wonder a little not-know  
'I am wondering what it means, I don't know.'
15. → *Fudan wa sonna nai n ja nai desu ka?*  
usually Top such not-exist Nom Tag Cop Q  
'Usually, there aren't such things, are there?'
16. → *Pekin toka shanghai toka anmari nai n ja nai desu ka?*  
Peijing for example Shanghai for example much not-exist Nom Tag Cop Q

<sup>2</sup> This *daroo* is self-questioning of T, which is known by its plain form. *Daroo*, the plain form of *deshou*, is seldom used by women when they are talking with someone because of the rough sounds (Cook 1999).

17. Mr.K: *U:n, pekin ya shanghai de wa anmari sonnan minakatta.*  
uhm Peijing and Shanghai in Top much that thing not-see  
'We::ll, we didn't see such things in Beijing and Shanghai. I don't know about
18. *pekin wa shiran kedo, [shanghai wa taite aru no mita dake de.*  
Peijing Top not know but Shanghai Top already built Nom saw only  
'Beijing, though, in Shanghai, I saw buildings after construction.'
19. Mrs.K: *[Shanghai wa ( )]*  
Shanghai Top  
'Shanghai is ( )'
20. T: *A, un, nanka chuushi. Sutoppu shite moo tsukuranai =*  
uh uh like stop Stop do more not build  
'Uh, well, "stop," and the construction was stopped and won't continue any more.'
21. Mr.K: = *Seito wa honto ni hashira dake. Sore ga monosugoi medatta.*  
Chengdu Top really pillar alone that S extremely outstanding  
'In Chengdu, buildings have only pillars indeed. It was extremely outstanding.'
22. (2)
23. H: *Sore wa seito ga sonna ni hatten shinai yoo ni itte koto de sutoppu*  
that Top Chengdu S so much develop in order not to QT because stop  
'That means [the government] stopped so that
24. *kaketa n desu ka?*  
order Nom Cop Q  
'Chengdu won't develop so much?'
25. Mrs.K: *Iya, kekkyoku dondon hatten shite itteru kara*  
well after all more and more developing therefore  
'Well, it is developing so rapidly, so
26. *minna ga soo [shiharu n desho.*  
everyone S so do [honorifics] Nom Aux  
'everyone (in the government?) does that, I guess.'
27. Mr.K: *[Nanika]*  
something  
'Something.'
28. T: *U:n, [doo daroo?]*  
Uh-huh how wonder  
'Well, I wonder why.'
29. Mrs.K: *Soshitara amarinimo hatten shitara ( )*  
then too much develop if  
'Then, if Chengdu develops so much, then ( )'
30. Mr.K: *[Ge-genchi no tsuuvaku no, gaido no]*  
lo- local LK translator LK guide LK  
'When I asked
31. *hito ni kiitara, so sorede shimai desu to.*  
person to when asking the-that end Cop QT  
'the Japanese-speaking local guide there, s/he said that's it.'
32. →Mrs.K: *Moo chuushi meirei ga detara. Chuugoku te soo desu wa nee.*  
now stop order S if come out China QT so Cop P P  
'If they were ordered, China is like that, isn't it?'
33. Mr.K: *Shooganai desu to.*  
Cannot be helped Cop QT  
'The guide said it cannot be helped.'
34. T: *Soo desu, soo desu. [sore wa shikata nai desu. Hai]*  
so Cop so Cop that Top cannot be helped Cop yes  
'Right, right. It cannot be helped. Yes.'
35. Mrs.K: *[Sore wa ne, moo ne.*  
that Top P EMP P  
'That's, well,'

36. T: Chuushi meirei ga ( )  
stop order S  
'An order to stop ( )'  
37. Mr.K: (Shooga nai na) na? ((laugh))  
cannot be helped P  
'(It cannot be helped), you know.'  
38. Sugu ni ( )  
immediately  
'Immediately ( )'.  
39. T: Sore wa doo shiyoo to shite mo shikata nai desu.  
that Top however hard we try cannot be helped Cop  
'It cannot be helped however hard we try.'

In lines 1-7, Mr. and Mrs. K explain that the Chinese government ordered construction to stop in Chengdu since economic progress there is so rapid. In line 8, Mrs. K solicits agreement, by saying *soo deshoo? chuugoku te* 'China is like that, isn't it?' This question does not necessarily specify T as an addressee because the political system in China is known in Japan. *Deshoo* with rising intonation asks for the hearer's agreement (Makino & Tsutsui 1989) or indexes a strong imposition of what the speaker says (Siegal 1996), although it takes the form of interrogation. Here, what Mrs. K indicates is that the governmental order is absolute in China even though it might be unreasonable. This is indexed by Mr. K's use of *sekkaku ... yarikaketeta noni* 'despite the great effort/pain for construction, (it was ordered to stop)' in line 5. The phrase *sekkaku -noni* indicates a negative feeling (regret, blame) about effort/pain that is not rewarded (Makino & Tsutsui 1989). Drawing on her alleged expertise and authentic knowledge through her travel to China as a resource or authority, Mrs. K solicits her epistemic stance in line 8. By soliciting T in this manner, Mrs. K categorizes China as a highly centralized country. In a negative sense, it could be constructed as a totalitarian country. At the same time, such a sequence results in assigning T a social identity as a member of such a country.

With reference to such practices, T attempts to refute what Mr. and Mrs. K solicit. In line 10, she is ambiguous with her answer, self-questioning *iya, doo daroo?* 'well, I wonder.' In line 12, T says *soo desu yo ne* 'I guess so; I agree.' As mentioned in excerpt (3), T might misuse *soo desu yo ne* 'I guess so; I agree' for *soo desu ne* 'let me see.' If not, here, T shows tentative alignment by saying *soo desu yo ne* and immediately afterwards withdraws the alignment. Immediately after this utterance, T brings her own travel experience to Chengdu as a basis of her refutation. After indicating that she is perplexed about the deserted buildings, T refutes what Mr. and Mrs. K have said by asking negative questions in 15 and 16: *fudan wa sonna nai n ja nai desu ka?* 'usually there aren't such things, are there?' and *pekin toka shanghai toka amari nai n ja nai desu ka?* 'in Beijing and Shanghai, there aren't such things, are there?' Here, T's use of a negative question *n ja nai desu ka?* deserves close attention. *N ja nai* is a negative form of *n(o) da*. *N(o) da* is used in order to involve the hearer in the affairs the speaker is talking about and/or to impose his/her idea upon the hearer, or at least, to emphasize his/her idea emotively (Makino & Tsutsui 1989: 327). The use of *n ja nai desu ka?* indexes T's stances toward her proposition that there are not such things with great certainty (epistemic stance) and emotional intensity (affective stance). Given that, these utterances may serve as rhetorical questions indicating T's strong negation 'it should not be.'

Responding to T's reframing, Mr. K affirms that they did not see such buildings in Shanghai in line 17 and 18. In line 32, after Mr. and Mrs. K elaborate their impressions based on what they saw and heard, Mrs. K solicits agreement again, from T and/or H, by saying *chuugoku te soo desu wa nee* 'China is like that, isn't it?' Another solicitation displays Mrs. K's epistemic stance that China is a highly centralized country.

(5)

1. Mrs.K: Soshitara ano... ryokoo nanka sareru no,  
then uh travel and the stuff do [honorific] Nom  
'Well. Then, when you travel,  
2. yappari kyoka moote desu ka?  
as expected permission get Cop Q  
'you have to get permission (as I expected)?'  
3. →T: (0.2) E? Ryokoo te kokunai ryokoo desu ka?=  
huh travel QT domestic travel Cop Q  
'Huh? You mean domestic travel?'  
4. Mr.K: Kokunai ryokoo  
domestic travel  
'Domestic travel.'  
5. T: Ie, kokunai wa betsu ni jiyuu desu.  
no domestic Top no problem free Cop  
'No, domestic travel is unrestricted.'  
6. Mr.K: A, furii.  
oh free  
'Oh, it's free.'  
7. →Mrs.K: A, soo desu ka?  
oh so Cop Q  
'Oh, really?'  
8. T: Kokunai wa furii, jiyuu ni doko demo.  
Domestic Top free freely anywhere  
'Domestic travel is free, we can go anywhere freely.'  
9. →Mrs.K: Iya, sono shuu\* ga, dokka no shuu ni ikoo toka suru to  
I mean well state 'S somewhere I.K state to go for example when going  
'I mean, the province, when you go to another province.'  
10. →T: A:, moo zenzen mondai nai desu.  
oh EMP at all problem not-exist Cop  
'Oh, it's no problem at all.'  
11. →Mrs.K: A, soo desu ka?  
oh so Cop Q  
'Oh, really?'

In line 1, Mrs. K's question assumes that people in China need permission when traveling. The word *yappari* 'as expected' again indicates that this idea is not only Mrs. K's but also what other people think, or common sense knowledge. T shows bewilderment or trouble in understanding Mrs. K's question, which is known by a repair initiator *e?* 'huh?' and a pause before that in line 3. T prompts other-initiated repair by asking a confirmation question *ryokoo te kokunai ryokoo desu ka?* 'you mean domestic travel?' and Mrs. K affirms it. Unlike a display of trouble which may be ascribed to the word itself (e.g., *bokuyoo* 'sheep breeding' as observed in line 5 of excerpt (3)), this trouble seems to be caused by the content of the question. That is, the question of

\* Here Mrs. K tries to indicate a Chinese administrative unit *shoo* 'province' although she uses a word *shuu* 'state.'



whether people need permission for domestic travel in China itself is quite out of T's realm of expectation. This seems to be why T provides an initiation of repair to clarify whether or not Mrs. K means domestic travel. After T replies that domestic travel is unrestricted, Mr. and Mrs. K show surprise, which is indicated by a news-receipt token, *a* and *soo desu ka* 'really?; is that so?' with surprising intonations. T further affirms what she said by repeating *furii, jiyuu ni doko demo* '[domestic travel] is free, freely, anywhere.' Various types of words to mention 'unrestricted' (*furii* 'free' in an English loan word, *jiyuu ni* 'freely' in a Sino-Japanese adverb, and *doko demo* 'anywhere' in native-Japanese) signify T's emphasis on freedom of travel as well as her reframing of Mrs. K's assumption. Nonetheless, Mrs. K again tries to confirm by a cross-question whether what T said is true when they go to another province. It follows Mrs. K's strong skepticism toward what T said. T again reframes what Mrs. K says by using a strong negation form with an intensifier, *zenzen mondai nai desu* 'it is no problem at all.' When T ratifies that there is no need for permission for domestic travel, Mrs. K responds with *a soo desu ka* again, with stress and surprising intonation in line 11. Here, Mrs. K's epistemic stance - her persistent assumption that people in China cannot travel freely even within the country - emerges through the repeated sequence of question - answer - assessment - confirmation question. This sequential analysis, in particular, lines 5-10 also shows T's change in epistemic and affective stance: Increasingly stronger rejection of Mrs. K's assumption regarding travel restrictions, in response to her continued display of surprise. By so doing, T is resisting Mrs. K's stereotypical categorization of China as a country without freedom.

(6) [Mrs. K serves *maccha* (whipped, ceremony-style tea) to T and H.]

1. Mr.K: *No- nonda koto aru?*  
d- drink have an experience  
'Have you ever had maccha?'
2. T: *E::: Ito.*  
well  
'We:::ll'
3. Mr.K: *Maccha.*  
maccha  
'Maccha.'
4. T: *[ ( ) desu yo ne hai.*  
Cop P P yes  
'( ), isn't it? Yes.'
5. Mrs.K: *[ Atsui, atsui, atsui, chotto atsui ka wakaran na.*  
hot, hot hot a little hot may be P  
'Hot, hot. It might be a little hot.'
6. →Mr.K: ((toward T)) *Ko-koohii nanka yori kore no hoo ga ii daroo.*  
co- coffee and the stuff than this LK side S good Tag  
'This is much better than coffee, isn't it?'
7. T: *Arigatoo gozaimasu.*  
Thank you  
'Thank you very much.'
8. Mrs.K: *Doozo. utsui desu yo.*  
here you go hot Cop P  
'Here you go. It is hot.'
9. T: *Hai.*  
yes  
'Yes.'
10. →Mr.K: *Nominikukattara moo oitoite.*

11. T: *A, daijoobu desu. ((laugh))*  
oh alright Cop  
'No, I am okay.'
12. →Mr.K: *Daijoobu?*  
alright  
'Are you okay?'
13. T: *Daijoobu desu*  
alright Cop  
'I am okay.'
14. H: *( )*  
'( )'
15. T: *I ( ) chido::, nido kurai kana?*  
o-once twice about wonder  
'Once, or I wonder if I have had it twice before?'
16. →Mrs.K: *Amai no tabete.*  
sweet Nom eat  
'Have some sweets.'
17. T: *Hai.*  
yes  
'Yes.'
18. T: *Ano::, Uji ni*  
uhm Uji in  
'Well, in Uji (name of a city in Kyoto prefecture)'
19. Mrs.K: *Uji? Aa*  
Uji oh  
'Uji? a:'
20. T: *De::, soko de, chotto omoccha o*  
in there in a little maccha O  
'In there, a little bit'
21. Mrs.K: *Un.*  
yeah  
'Yeah.'
22. T: *itadatta koto ga arimashita. ((laugh))*  
drink had experience  
'I have had maccha.'
23. →Mrs.K: ((topic moves to another for a while))  
*Nominikukattara oitoite kudasai*  
If hard to drink leave please  
'If it is hard to drink, please leave it alone.'
24. →T: *Ie. zenzen*  
no at all  
'No, not at all.'
25. →Mrs.K: *Doo mo nai?*  
alright Neg  
'Are you really alright?'
26. T: *Un. ((laugh))*  
yeah  
'Yeah.'

In line 6, Mr. K says *koohii nanka yori kore no hoo ga ii daroo* 'this [maccha] is much better than coffee, isn't it?' What underlies Mr. K's utterance is that *maccha* is a better drink to serve than coffee to foreigners since the tea ceremony is considered a typical Japanese cultural practice. The word *nanka* indicates downplay/degrading of a reference (Suzuki 1996), in this case, coffee. *Daroo*, a plain form of *deshoo*, signifies

Mr. K's strong assumption about *maccha* service. At the same time, this statement assigns T a social identity as a non-native of Japanese culture. In line 10, Mr. K mentions that T does not have to finish *maccha* if it is too hard to drink for her. He then asks whether T is okay with the *maccha* in line 12. This implies that Mr. K regards T as a novice of tea ceremony practice. Likewise, in line 16, Mrs. K instructs T how to have *maccha* by telling her to have sweets first [then drink the tea]. In lines 15-22, T attempts to reframe this 'novice' categorization by talking about her experience of having *maccha* in Uji (a city in Kyoto prefecture). Nonetheless, after a while, in line 23, Mrs. K again asks T to leave the tea if it is hard to drink. T negates this with the intensifier *ie zenzen* 'no, not at all' in line 24, but again Mrs. K asks T whether she is really fine with the tea in line 25. Thus, Mr. and Mrs. K repeatedly say that T does not have to finish drinking and ask T the same confirmation question despite T's repeated answer. Contrary to Mr. and Mrs. K's consideration, this results in *gaijinization* (Iino 1996), i.e., auto-exoticizing the Japanese culture (Kasper & Rose 2002; Coulmas 1992), which alienates T to the rank of a Japanese cultural novice, treating a cultural item as 'my own.'

(7) [After excerpt (7), H mentions that she has learned tea ceremony before.]

1. H: *Gochisoo sama de f shita.*  
Thank you Cop  
'Thank you for the tea.'
2. T: [ *gochisoo sama deshita.*  
thank you Cop  
'Thank you.'
3. H: *Kekko na otemae deshita.*  
Nice way of making tea Cop  
'Kekkoo na otemae deshita ('nice way of making tea').'
4. Mrs.K: *Iete, tondemonai desu yo* ((laugh))  
no no at all Cop P  
'No, not at all.'
5. →Mr.K: *Kekkoo na otemae deshita to nihongo de yuu.*  
*kekkoo na otemae deshita* QT Japanese in say  
'We say 'nice way of making tea' in Japanese.'
6. T: *E? kekkoo?* (0.5)  
huh kekkoo  
'Huh? Kekkoo?'
7. →Mr.K: *Oemae. Nohongo de otemae chuun da ne.*  
Otemae Japanese in otemae TQ say Cop P  
'Oemae. In Japanese, we call it otemae ('way of making tea').'
8. T: *A:*  
uh  
'Uh.'
9. Mr.K: *Ocha no sahoo.*  
tea I.K way of making  
'The way of making tea.'
10. T: *Hai, sakihodo*  
yes sakihodo  
'Yes. 'sakihodo' ('just a while ago').'
11. H: [ *Un?*  
um  
'Huh?'
12. Mr.K: [ *Iya, chigau.*  
'No, that's mistaken.'

13. T: *A moo ikkai*  
uh more once  
'uh, once again?'
14. H: *Kekkoo na otemae deshita.*  
*kekkoo na otemae deshita*  
'Kekkoona otemae deshita.'
15. T: *A., kekkoo na (otemae deshita) \**  
uh kekkoo na (otemae deshita)  
'uh, kekkoo na (otemae deshita).'
16. →Mr.K: *Chotto setsumei shitagete.*  
a little explain give (for her)  
'Please explain for her about tea ceremony.'

What H said in line 3 is a set phrase uttered when one finishes drinking tea in the ceremony. Following that, in line 5, Mr. K says *kekkoo na otemae deshita to nihongo de yuu* '[we] say kekkoo na otemae deshita ('nice way of making tea') in Japanese.' This utterance is an example of 'recipient design,' which categorizes T as a NNS of Japanese, thereby assigning T a social identity as such. Despite the absence of specific nomination of the recipient, by stating *nihongo de* 'in Japanese,' Mr. K directs this utterance to T, not to H or Mrs. K. T seems to display trouble with hearing or understanding the phrase *kekkoo na otemae deshita* 'nice way of making tea,' which is speculated by her repair initiation *e?* 'huh' and a short pause. Upon hearing this, Mr. K supplies other repair: The word *otemae* following *kekkoo* in line 7. Here, he again mentions 'in Japanese' that orients the talk to the categorization of NSs and NNSs of Japanese. Mr. K paraphrases the term *otemae* to *ocha no sahoo* 'ways of making tea' in line 9, and T tried to practice the set phrase but makes a mistake in uttering it in line 10. This triggers two pieces of repair initiation: *un?* 'huh?' with rising intonation made by H and Mr. K's utterance *iya, chigau* 'no, that's mistaken.' Following that, T asks H to repeat the phrase and tries self repair of the phrase in lines 13-15.

This repair sequence reveals T's social identity as a novice of tea ceremony as well as a NNS of Japanese. Mr. K lectures about phrases used for tea ceremony as well as in general use. When T makes a mistake, Mr. K also initiates T's repair by pointing it out. T replies to this other-initiated repair with H's help. Furthermore, in line 16, Mr. K asks H, who had learned tea ceremony, to explain more for T's benefit. By so doing, Mr. K treats T as an 'unknowing recipient' who is assumed not to have prior knowledge of the event (Goodwin 1981). The benefactor auxiliary verb *-te ageru* '(explain) for her' also indicates the categorization of T as a novice to receive explanation, whereas H is marked as an expert. Thus, through this interaction, cultural membership becomes salient: Mr. K assigns social identities to T as a NNS of Japanese, a cultural novice, and non-Japanese; whereas T also accepts these identities by co-constructing the repair process.

(8) [Per Mr. K's request, H explains the tea ceremony]

1. H: *De, sono ato ni, kono ousu ite iu, chotto karui yatsu o*  
then that after this ousu QT called a little light one O  
'Then, after that, [we have] this, called ousu ('light tea'), a bit thinner one.'
2. Mr.K: *Yappari kore, usucha dakara ousu yuu no?*  
as expected this thin tea because ousu say P  
'This is called ousu since it is thin/light tea?'
3. H: (0.5) *To omoimasu kedo.*  
QT to think but

4. T: *Hee. A. sugoi*<sup>9</sup>  
oh oh great  
'Oh, great.'
5. →Mrs.K: *= Benkyoo sennan no desho? Nihon no yappari bunka o.*  
have to study Nom Tag Japan LK as expected culture O  
'You have to study Japanese culture, as expected, don't you?'
6. T: *A::*  
a::  
'Well.'
7. Mrs.K: *[Kaigai overseas*  
'Overseas.'
8. H: *[So-soo desu ne. ((laugh))*  
s- so Cop P  
'Oh, well, I guess so.'
9. →Mrs.K: *Benkyoo shitokanu naran no nee.*  
study have to do P P  
'You have to continue studying Japanese culture
10. *nihon no bunka chuu no o. [kaigai de wa.*  
Japan LK culture QT Nom O overseas in Top  
'When you came to Japan from overseas.'
11. →T: *[so::: desu ne.*  
so Cop P  
'We:::ll.'
12. Mr.K: *[Chotto futari tomo ( )<sup>9</sup> ((laugh))*  
a little you two  
'Both of you guys are a bit ( )'
13. T: ((laugh))
14. →Mrs.K: *Soo omowaharu desho?*  
so think [honorifics] Tag  
'You must think so, right?'
15. →T: *A. u::n. ((laugh))*  
oh uh-huh  
'Oh, mmm'
16. →Mrs.K: *Nihon no koto, rekishi mo ironna koto shitokannan naa to.*  
Japan LK things history also various things have to know P QT  
'About Japan, [ you think] that [you] have to know history and various thing.'
17. →T: *U:::n. ((laugh))*  
uh-huh  
'Uh-huh:::.'
18. Mr.K: *Dakara, okoicha ni tatsuru ousu. Kousu ya.*  
so thick tea versus thin tea thick-and-thin Cop  
'So, ousu, contrast to thick tea. Contrast between thick and thin tea.'

Given that H explains tea ceremony immediately prior to excerpt (8) and T provides a news-recipient token *hee* 'oh' and assessment *a sugoi* 'oh, great' in line 4, the categorization between H as an expert and T as a novice of tea ceremony/Japanese culture has been set up. In line 5, Mrs. K initiates a topic by asking a question *benkyoo sennan* (in SJ, *shinakereba naranai*) *no desho? Nihon no bunka o yappari*. '[you] have to study Japanese culture as expected, don't you?' Use of *yappari* indicates that it is not her personal idea but a widely recognized one. By specifically mentioning 'to study Japanese culture,' just like 'in Japanese' in excerpt (6), Mrs. K's question assigns T a social identity as a non-native/learner of Japanese culture. Parallel to this, the question

also assigns T a discourse identity as a respondent. However, T does not provide a clear uptake but produces pre-answering vocalization *a::* 'a::' in line 6.

In lines 9-10, Mrs. K again states that foreign students coming from overseas have to study Japanese culture, by saying *benkyoo shitokanu naran no nee* (in SJ, *shite okanakereba naranai no nee*) '[you] have to study Japanese culture [for the future].' This time, Mrs. K uses not a question but the obligatory phrase *shitokanu naran* (in SJ, *shite okanakereba naranai*) '[you] have to study Japanese culture [for the future]' with sentence final particles *no* and *nee*. Here, *no* is used to impose the speaker's idea upon the hearer, or, at the least, to emphasize the speaker's idea emotively (Makino & Tsutsui 1989: 327). *Ne(e)* solicits agreement from the hearer, and here this function is emphasized by the prolongation of the vowel and stress. T shows tentative alignment by saying *so::: desu ne* 'we:::ll, I guess so' in line 11. However, the significant prolongation of the vowel indicates T's hesitation to immediately agree with Mrs. K. In line 14, Mrs. K further solicits agreement from T, saying *soo omowaharu desho?* (in SJ, *soo omowareru* [honorifics] *desho?*) '[you] think so, don't you?' However, T provides no clear uptake or alignment this time either. She just says *u::n* 'mmm' and laughs in line 15.

Likewise, in line 16, although Mrs. K further elaborates solicitation, T responds to it with a longer prolonged token and laughter alone. The sequential analysis reveals a different participation structure from previous ones: There are no clear adjacency pairs, such as question and answer, repair-initiation and repair, or solicitation and reply. T's responses are totally uncommitted to Mrs. K's response-pursuing that continues to coercively assign T a social identity as a novice cultural learner. In other words, the interaction is not mutually ratified. It is not clear, either, whether this lack of clear response is considered as T's covert disagreement or resistance to the social identity assigned by Mrs. K, or as mere time buying necessary to deliver her opinion. The former is probable, given that T delivers alignment without hesitation in other situations (e.g., lines 21, 25 in excerpt (2), line 34 in (4)). It seems reasonable to consider that T tried to show her resistance against being coercively formulated as a learner of Japanese culture by not providing a clear uptake. In other words, T tries to reject the assigned social identity by refusing the assigned discourse identity as a respondent to Mrs. K's question and solicitation.

There are some noteworthy items to mention with respect to epistemic stance. Unlike T's reframing of Mr. K's utterance in excerpts (1), (4), and (5) where T can base her opinion on the objective facts, T is asked her own opinion. That is, T's ground for reframing is less tenable than in former cases where she ascribes opposite views to facts she saw rather than to her personal thoughts. It leads T to a more difficult situation to handle. If she directly disagrees with Mrs. K, it would result in a face-threatening-act toward the hostess and scholarship sponsor. Given these analyses, it seems reasonable to consider that T tried to resist against being discursively formulated as a learner of Japanese culture by means of not providing clear uptake. Nonetheless, Mr. and Mrs. K do not notice it and return to lecturing about the tea ceremony, by pursuing a prior topic in line 18. Even after the topic develops in a different direction, participants may retrieve it by coercively referring to the prior topic, as seen in this utterance. This may imply power relationships where one person has control over another, just like the phenomenon of interruption (e.g., Zimmerman & West 1975).

<sup>9</sup> Here Mr. K tries to change the topic but was not successful.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1. Discursive construction of exoticization

The analysis above has illustrated how the participants make exoticization and/or interculturality relevant in the development of talk. There are several means for discursively carrying out this process: 1) topic selection and how to deliver it; 2) sequential development of participation in talk; and 3) use of linguistic and non-linguistic resources as stance markers.

Delivering a topic with clear specification of culture/nationality (e.g., excerpts (1) and (2)) makes the talk interculturally relevant, orients the participants to follow the topic, and may designate the person who should respond (recipient design). Based on an initiated topic, participants collaboratively develop talk, following a certain order of turns, such as the question - answer - assessment - confirmation question sequences, each of which may designate the person who should respond. Participants assign or are assigned and/or assert or are asserted their discourse and social identities in the sequences. They discursively create categorization, such as developing country vs. developed country (excerpts (1) and (2)), NS vs. NNS (excerpt (7)), novice of Japanese culture vs. expert (excerpt (8)), and so on. Talk-in-interaction is a locus of identity assignment, assertion, and negotiation as well, as seen in several excerpts above. As a form of resistance against assigned identities, T asserts different identities in excerpts (3), (4), and (5). T reframes negative images of Xinjiang Uigur and China that assign T a social identity as a member of such a community. In excerpt (8), T tries to resist an assigned social identity as a learner of Japanese culture by not providing a clear uptake, i.e., refusing discourse identities. This is similar to Day's (1994) findings that Tang resisted ethnification by providing only a minimal response.

In addition to construction of identities and categorization through organization of talk, there are several means to index epistemic and affective stances and speakers' assumptions: Choice of the types of question, i.e., negative-, yes-no-, wh-, or cross-questions (e.g., excerpts (2), (3), and (5)); modal expressions (e.g., *yappari* 'as expected'; *daroo/deshoo* 'isn't it?'); and lexical choice of a word with a certain connotation (e.g., *koshiraeru* 'to make' in excerpt (3)); interactional particles, such as *no* and *ne(e)*; and prosodic features (rising intonation in excerpts (5) and (7)). Utilizing these means as a resource, the participants interactively organize their participation and orientation in talk.

### 5.2. Common sense knowledge problematized

Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) state that in the selection of social categories, 'common sense knowledge' plays an important role. As is often argued in critical theories, common sense knowledge is a social construction (e.g., Foucault 1980; Pennycook 2001). Hall, grounded in Douglas' (1966) work, states: "social groups impose meaning on their world by ordering and organizing things into a classificatory system" (2001: 329-330). Nishizaka (1995) also mentions, in arguing ideological issues in NS-NNS interactions, that whether a NNS does not really know Japanese culture or does not matter; what matters is what the speaker *assumes* about NNSs (emphasis added).

Through the interactions in the data above, several assumptions of Mr. and Mrs. K emerged. Xinjiang Uigur as well as China is a developing region; Also, China is perceived as a highly centralized country, or one without freedom. The above can be regarded as examples of exoticization of Xinjiang Uigur and China through being seen as developing, mysterious, different from, and even inferior to Japan. Also, just like Iino's (1996) host families, Mr. and Mrs. K exoticize Japanese culture by assuming that *maccha* is better to serve to foreigners.

Thus, this study has demonstrated exoticization where social identities/categories are discursively constructed, thereby delineating and perpetuating the boundaries between self and others. These practices may further contribute to the exercise of power of NS over NNS. In intercultural communication, it is a fact that there is a difference between participants from different cultures; however, if the difference is utilized as a resource for formulating a sense of superiority/inferiority, a bias, or discrimination, it definitely affects SLA processes and should be problematized. Mr. and Mrs. K had no intention to mistreat T; nonetheless, their interaction with T turned out to be a covert power exercise in a form they consider 'common sense knowledge' (e.g., *maccha* is hard to drink for foreigners; assertion that foreign students have to learn Japanese culture). The analysis of the data also reveals T's covert resistance; however, Mr. and Mrs. K did not seem to notice it at all. As Garret and Baquedano-López criticized, such ideologies disguised as common sense knowledge "go partially or wholly unrecognized (or misrecognized) by those whose actions and practices are bringing them about" (2002: 354).

Mrs. K's statement that foreigners/NNSs should learn the host culture is parallel to the traditional concept in SLA that it is the NNS, not the NS, who have to be responsible for communication in host societies. As Pennycook keenly points out, "applied linguistics is rife with problematic construction of otherness" (2001: 142). This is also applicable to any interaction. Heritage states: "all social interaction must inevitably be asymmetric on moment-to-moment basis and many interactions are likely to embody substantial asymmetry when moment-to-moment participation is aggregated over the course of one or more encounter" (2004: 237). What one assumes as 'common sense' may become a power exercise to others, whether among researchers or among ordinary people.

## 6. Conclusion and implications

As SLA studies taking a critical perspective point out, NSs and host societies are not neutral or fair but largely influenced by ideologies. This study illustrated exoticization, one such ideological phenomenon. The identity as a cultural Other is formulated by the NSs embodying such ideologies, rather than the NNS's language ability. Traditional theories have exclusively focused on L2 ability as their research agenda. However, given T's near-native fluency, it is clear that SLA studies should also direct attention to social and ideological issues in a host society as a learning environment.

Thus, analyzing NS-NNS interaction from interactional, social, and political perspectives reveals the power exercise of NS over NNS, neglected in traditional studies. It also provides further evidence that intercultural communication is co-constructed (e.g., Jacoby & Ochs 1990), and NNSs are not passive participants but "selective and active

contributors to the meaning and outcome of interaction" (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986: 165), as exemplified by T's resistance in this study. As Kasper (1997) states, total convergence to a host culture is not desirable for learners. Also, it is problematic that learners internalize assigned identity (e.g., perpetual foreigner) by monolingual NSs (Cole & Zuengler 2003). In order to raise consciousness about ideological issues in a host society, more studies from interactional and critical perspectives are called for.

This is beyond the scope of this study, but the historical and structural processes which set the parameter of social boundaries (Williams 1992: 218) should also be examined for a better understanding of SLA. What underlies the speakers' assumption is a historically and socially constructed set of ideologies, which becomes naturalized as 'common sense.' Idealized models in traditional SLA may force researchers to overlook what learners face in reality in L2 environments, which are not necessarily ideal for learners. Critical views and examination of naturally occurring data from an interactional perspective will become more and more necessary in order to gain more emic understanding of SLA studies.

## References

- Antaki, C., & S. Widdicombe (1998) Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 1-14.
- Baquedano-López, P. (1997) Creating social identity through *Doctorina* narratives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 8.1: 27-45.
- Cole, K., & J. Zuengler (2003) Engaging in an authentic science project: Appropriating, resisting, and denying "scientific" identities. In R. Bayley & S.R. Schecter (eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, H.M. (1999) Situational meanings of Japanese social deixis: The mixed use of the *masu* and plain forms. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8.1: 87-110.
- Cornell, S., & D. Hartmann (1998) *Ethnicity and Race: Making identities in a changing world*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Coulmas, F. (1992) Linguistic etiquette in Japanese society. In R.J. Watts, S. Ide, and K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 299-323.
- Day, D. (1994) Tang's dilemma and other problems: Ethnification processes at some multicultural workplaces. *Pragmatics* 4: 315-336.
- Day, D. (1998) Being ascribed, and resisting, membership of an ethnic group. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 151-170.
- Derrida, J. (1981) *Positions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Douglas, M. (1966) *Purity and Danger*. London: Routledge.
- Duff, P. (2002) The Discourse co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics* 23.3: 289-322.
- Firth, A., & J. Wagner (1997) On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal* 81: 285-300.
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon.
- Garret, P.B., & P. Baquedano-López (2002) Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 339-361.
- Goodwin, C. (1981) *Conversational organization: interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1987) Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50: 115-131.
- Hall, S. (2001) The spectacle of the other. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates (eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A reader*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 324-344.
- Hawkins, M.R. (2005) Becoming a student: Identity work and academic literacies in Early schooling. *TESOL Quarterly* 39.1: 59-82.
- Harklau, L. (2003) Representational practices and multi-modal communication in US high schools: Implications for adolescent immigrants. In R. Barley & S.R. Schecter (eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 83-97.
- He, A. (2003) Novices and their speech roles in Chinese heritage language classes. In R. Barley & S.R. Schecter (eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 128-146.
- Heritage, J. (2004) Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing data. In D. Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage, pp. 222-245.
- Iino, M. (1996) "Excellent foreigner!": *Gaijinization of Japanese language and culture in contact situations-An ethnographic study of dinner table conversations between Japanese host families and American students*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- Kasper, G. (1997) Can pragmatic competence be taught? (Net Work #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu, University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Available: <http://www.ill.hawaii.edu/nflrc/NetWorks/NW6>.
- Kasper, G., & R.K. Rose (2002) *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kondo, D. (1990) *Crafting selves: Power, gender, and discourses of identity in a Japanese workplace*. Chicago, IL: University Chicago Press.
- Kubota, R. (2002) The impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & D. Cameron (eds.), *Globalization and Language Teaching*. London: Routledge, pp. 13-28.
- Kuno, S. (1978) *Danwa no bumpoo* ('Grammar in discourse'). Tokyo, Japan: Taishukan Shoten.
- Lo, A. (2004) Evidentiality and morality in a Korean heritage language school. *Pragmatics* 14.2/3: 235-256.
- Markee, N., & G. Kasper (2004) Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal* 88.4: 491-500.
- Maynard, S. (1991) Discourse and interactional functions of the Japanese modal adverb *yahari/yappari*. *Language Sciences* 12: 39-57.

- Maynard, S. (1999) Grammar, with attitude: On the expressivity of certain *da* sentences in Japanese. *Linguistics* 37.2: 215-250.
- Maynard, M.W., & D.H. Zimmerman. (1984) Topical talk, ritual, and the social organization of relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 47: 301-316.
- Makino, S., & M. Tsutsui (1989) *A dictionary of basic Japanese grammar*. Tokyo, Japan: Japan Times.
- Mori, J. (2003) The Construction of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36.2: 143-184.
- Nishizaka, A. (1995) The interactive constitution of interculturality: How to be a Japanese with words. *Human Studies* 18: 301-326.
- Norton, B. (2000) *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. Essex, UK: Pearson Education.
- Ochs, E. (2002) Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. Kramsch (ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum, pp. 99-120.
- Oktar, L. (2001) The ideological organization of representational processes in the presentation of us and them. *Discourse and Society* 12.3: 313-346.
- Pavlenko, A. (2002) Poststructuralist approaches to the study of social factors in second language learning and use. In V. Cook (ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 277-302.
- Pennycook, A. (2001) *Critical applied linguistics*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.
- Roberts, C. (1998) Language acquisition or language socialization in and through discourse: Toward a redefinition of the domain of SLA. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* 4: 31-42.
- Sacks, H. (1972) An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in social interaction*. New York: Free Press, pp. 31-74.
- Sacks, H. (1979) Hotrodler: A revolutionary category. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington, pp. 23-53.
- Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Saif, S. (1998) Some uses and meanings of utterance: Initial *iyu* in Japanese discourse. *Korean and Japanese Linguistics* 4: 121-137.
- Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. London: Routledge.
- Schieffelin, B.B., & E. Ochs (1986) Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 163-191.
- Shea, D. (1994) Perspective and production: Structuring conversational participation across cultural borders. *Pragmatics* 4.3: 357-389.
- Siegal, M. (1994) *Learning Japanese as a second language in Japan and the interaction of race, gender, and social context*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California-Berkeley, Berkeley, CA. Dissertation Abstract International, 56, 1692.
- Siegal, M. (1996) The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics* 17: 356-382.

- Suzuki, S. (1996) Pejorative connotation: A case of Japanese. In A.H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (eds.), *Discourse Markers – Description and Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 261-276.
- Talmy, S. (2004) Forever FOB: The cultural production of ESL in a high school. *Pragmatics* 14.2/3: 149-172.
- Talmy, S. (2005) *Lifers and FOBs, rocks and resistance: Generation 1.5, identity, and the cultural productions of ESL in a high school*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu, HI.
- Watson-Gegeo, K.A., & S. Nielsen (2003) Language socialization in SLA. In C. Doughty & M. Long (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, pp. 155-177.
- Williams, G. (1992) *Sociolinguistics: A Sociological Critique*. London: Routledge.
- Yamaguchi, T. (2003) Reanalysis of contrastive *-wa* in Japanese: Perspectives from newspaper articles. *Pragmatics* 13.3: 423-450.
- Zimmerman, D.H. (1998) Identity, context, and interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in talk*. London: Sage, pp. 87-106.
- Zimmerman, D.H., & C. West (1975) Sex roles, interruption, and silence in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 225-274.

## Appendix

### Transcription conventions

{	overlap
?	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
:	elongated syllable
::	longer elongated syllable
<u>text</u>	stress
(1.2)	length of significant pause in seconds
(.)	micropause
((text))	non-verbal behaviors
=	turn latching
!	animated pronunciation
~	false start
( )	unsure hearings
(word)	conjectured string
[text](in translation)	element ellipted in Japanese texts

### Abbreviations

Aux:	Auxiliary
Cop:	Various forms of copula verb <i>be</i>
LK:	Linking nominal
Neg:	Negative morpheme
Nom:	Nominalizer
O:	Object marker
P:	Particle



Q:	Question marker
QT:	Quotative marker
S:	Subject marker
Tag:	Tag-like expression
Top:	Topic marker